

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-32 are now present in the application. The specification and drawings have been amended. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 12-32 have been added. Claims 1, 12, 19 and 26 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 5, 7 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant greatly appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, independent claims 12, 19 and 26 have been added to include the subject matter of claims 5, 7 and 9, respectively, as discussed hereinbelow.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. §119

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 3, 2003, and for providing Applicant with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

Specification Objections

The title has been objected to due to the non-descriptiveness. The title has been amended to address the Examiner's requested changes. Accordingly, this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's specification objection are respectfully requested.

Drawings Objections

The drawings have been objected under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4). Applicant has submitted one (1) sheet of corrected formal drawings to address the Examiner's requested changes. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these objections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's drawings objections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,486,596. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding to the Examiner's rejections, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "each of the plurality of apertures at a central portion of the shadow mask having a continuously arcuate periphery". Applicant respectfully submits that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, Inoue fails to teach the above combination of the elements recited in amended independent claim 1 because it only teaches that the apertures 51 of the shadow mask have two linear portions (see FIGs. 11 and 13) rather than a continuously arcuate periphery. Since Inoue fails to teach each and every limitation of independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Inoue.

In addition, claims 2-11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above amendments to the claims and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3, 4, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Ishii et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,548,954. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejections is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

As mentioned above, Inoue fail to teach the above combination of elements recited in amended independent claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Ishii, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings of the ratio of the holes. This reference also fails to disclose the above combination of the elements recited in amended independent claim 1. In addition, Ishii only teaches the ratio of the holes for the black matrix layer, and fails to teach the ratio of the apertures for the

shadow mask as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Ishii fails to cure the deficiencies of Inoue.

In addition, claims 2-11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above amendments to the claims and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 12-32 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Independent claims 12, 19 and 26 have been added to include the subject matter of dependent claims 5, 7 and 9, respectively, which were indicated by the Examiner as including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 12, 19 and 26 are in condition for allowance.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-18, 20-25, and 27-32 are allowable due to their respective dependence on independent claims 12, 19 and 26, as well as due to the additional recitations included in these claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 12-32 are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.


Application No.: 10/698,380
Art Unit 2879

Attorney Docket No. 0630-1860P
Amendment filed on January 19, 2005
Page 18

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538

JTE/GH/mmi/asc
0630-1860P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000